arXiv:1402.6918v1 [math.GR] 27 Feb 2014

Zappa-Szép products of Garside monoids

Volker Gebhardt, Stephen Tawn

28th February 2014

Abstract

We define the internal Zappa-Szép product $K = G \bowtie H$ of two monoids G and H by the existence of unique decompositions of elements of K as products of elements of G and H; this definition gives rise to actions of the factor monoids on each other, which we show to be structure preserving.

We prove that the Zappa-Szép product of two monoids is a Garside monoid if and only if both of the factors are Garside monoids.

In this case, the factors are parabolic submonoids of K and the Garside structure of K can be described in terms of the Garside structures of the factors. We give explicit isomorphisms between the lattice structures of K and the product of the lattice structures on the factors that respect the Garside normal forms. In particular, we obtain bijections between the normal form language of K and the product of the normal form languages of its factors.

1 Introduction

The notion of Zappa-Szép products generalises those of direct and semidirect products; the key property is that every element of the Zappa-Szép product can be written uniquely as a product of two elements, one from each factor, in any given order.

For instance, a group K is the (internal) *Zappa-Szép product* of two subgroups G and H, written $K = G \bowtie H$, if for every $k \in K$ there exist unique elements $g \in G$ and $h \in H$ such that $gh = k$, or equivalently, if $K = GH$ and $G \cap H = \{\mathbf{1}\}$. As taking inverses is an anti-isomorphism, one also has $K = HG$ and one obtains unique elements $g' \in G$ and $h' \in H$ such that $h'g' = k$. However, in general neither $g = g'$ nor $h = h'$ need to hold. The special case that one of the factors, say G, is a normal subgroup yields a semidirect product $G \rtimes H$; if both factors are normal, one obtains the direct product $G \times H$.

Note that if we consider the case of monoids, the symmetry under swapping the factors is not automatic, that is, $K = GH$ need not imply $K = HG$.

Zappa-Szép products have been studied for various categories of algebraic objects by many authors; see for instance [Cas41, Zap42, Szé50, Szé51, RS55,

Both authors acknowledge support under Australian Research Council's Discovery Projects funding scheme (project number DP1094072). Volker Gebhardt acknowledges support under the Spanish Project MTM2010-19355.

MSC-class: 20F36 (Primary) 20M13, 06F05 (Secondary)

Szé62, Tak81, Kun83, Pic01, Bri05, God10, ACIM09, AM11]. (There are subtle differences in definitions between some of these references, for instance regarding the symmetry under swapping of factors.)

In the context of Garside monoids, Zappa-Szép products were studied by Picantin [Pic01]; he used the term *crossed products*. Given a family $M_1, \dots, M_\ell$ of Garside monoids and a family of maps $\Theta_{i,j} : M_i \times M_j \to M_j$ that satisfy some compatibility conditions, Picantin constructs a Garside structure on the set $M_1 \times \cdots \times M_\ell$, that is, he considers *external* Zappa-Szép products. (He uses this construction to show that every Garside monoid is the iterated crossed product of Garside monoids that have a cyclic centre.)

Picantin's construction is, however, very technical and not easy to work with in practice. The difficulty comes from the compatibility conditions for the maps $\Theta_{i,j}$, which are needed to ensure that the way in which the factors M_i are made to interact is consistent and the external Zappa-Szép product is well-defined.

We are primarily interested in *decomposing* a given Garside monoid into simpler components that are also Garside monoids. In this situation, the way in which the potential factors interact is defined by the ambient monoid and there is no need for explicit compatibility conditions. It is therefore natural for us to consider *internal* Zappa-Szép products:

Definition 1. Given a monoid K with two submonoids G and H, say that K is the (internal) *Zappa-Szép product* of G and H, written $K = G \bowtie H$, if for every $k \in K$ there exist unique $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$ such that $g_1 h_1 = k = h_2 g_2$.

We will say that $g_1 h_1$ is the GH-decomposition of k and that $h_2 g_2$ is its HG-decomposition.



It is obvious from this definition that forming internal Zappa-Szép products is commutative (that is, $K = G \bowtie H$ if and only if $K = H \bowtie G$). It is, however, not associative, that is $K = (F \bowtie G) \bowtie H$, meaning that there exists a submonoid K' such that $K = K' \bowtie H$ and $K' = F \bowtie G$, does not imply $K = F \bowtie (G \bowtie H)$; see Example 33. Our construction can easily be applied iteratively; we therefore restrict to the case of two factors.

Picantin shows that, for each ordering of the factors in a crossed product, an element of the product can be written uniquely as a product of elements of the factors in that order [Pic01, Proposition 3.6]. Hence every crossed product is also a Zappa-Szép product in the sense of Definition 1.

The structure of the paper is as follows: In Section 2 we recall the main concepts used in the paper and fix notation. In Section 3 we define actions of the factors of a Zappa-Szép product on each other and analyse their properties. Section 4 is devoted to the case that either the Zappa-Szép product of two monoids is a Garside monoid or that both of the factors are; we will show that both conditions are equivalent. Finally, in Section 5 we consider the situation where the Garside elements of the factors and of the product are chosen in a compatible way; we will show that in this case the regular language of normal forms in the product can be described effectively in terms of those of the factors.

2 Background

In order to fix notation, we briefly recall the main concepts used in the paper. For details we refer to [DP99, Deh02, DDG+].

Let M be a monoid. The monoid M is called *left-cancellative* if for any x, y, y' in M, the equality $xy = xy'$ implies $y = y'$. Similarly, M is called *right-cancellative* if for any x, y, y' in M, the equality $yx = y'x$ implies $y = y'$.

For $x, y \in M$, we say that x is a *left-divisor* or *prefix* of y, writing $x \preccurlyeq_M y$, if there exists an element $u \in M$ such that $y = xu$. If the monoid is obvious, we simply write $x \preccurlyeq y$ to reduce clutter. Similarly, we say that x is a *right-divisor* or *suffix* of y, writing $y \succcurlyeq_M x$ or $y \succcurlyeq x$, if there exists $u \in M$ such that $y = ux$. Moreover, we say that x is a *factor* of y, writing $x \dot{\curlyvee} y$, if there exist elements $u, v \in M$ such that $y = uxv$. If M does not contain any non-trivial invertible elements, then the relation $\preccurlyeq$ is a partial order if M is left-cancellative, and the relation $\succcurlyeq$ is a partial order if M is right-cancellative.

An element $a \in M \setminus \{\mathbf{1}\}$ is called an *atom* if whenever $a = uv$ for $u, v \in M$, either $u = \mathbf{1}$ or $v = \mathbf{1}$ holds. The existence of atoms implies that M does not contain any non-trivial invertible elements. The monoid M is said to be *atomic* if it is generated by its set $\mathcal{A}$ of atoms and if for every element $x \in M$ there is an upper bound on the length of decompositions of x as a product of atoms, that is, if $||x||_{\mathcal{A}} := \sup\{k \in \mathbb{N} : x = a_1 \cdots a_k \text{ with } a_1, \ldots, a_k \in \mathcal{A}\} < \infty$.

An element $d \in M$ is called *balanced*, if the set of its left-divisors is equal to the set of its right-divisors. In this case, we write $\mathrm{Div}(d)$ for the set of (left- and right-) divisors of d.

Definition 2. A *quasi-Garside structure* is a pair (M, Δ) where M is a monoid and Δ is an element of M such that

(a) M is cancellative and atomic,

(b) the prefix and suffix relations are lattice orders, that is, for any pair of elements there exist unique least common upper bounds and unique greatest common lower bounds with respect to $\preccurlyeq$ respectively $\succcurlyeq$,

(c) Δ is balanced, and

(d) M is generated by the divisors of Δ.

If the set of divisors of Δ is finite then we say that (M, Δ) is a *Garside structure*.

A monoid M is a (quasi)-Garside monoid if there exists a *(quasi)-Garside element* $\Delta \in M$ such that (M, Δ) is a (quasi)-Garside structure.

Remark. If M is a Garside monoid then the choice of Garside element is not unique. Indeed, if Δ is a Garside element then Δ^ℓ is also a Garside element for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

If (M, Δ) is a quasi-Garside structure in the above sense, then in the terminology of [DDG+], the set $\mathrm{Div}(\Delta)$ forms a bounded Garside family for the monoid M. The elements of $\mathrm{Div}(\Delta)$ are called *simple elements*. (Note that the set of simple elements depends on the choice of the Garside element.)

Notation 3. If M is a left-cancellative atomic monoid, then least common upper bounds and greatest common lower bounds are unique if they exist. In this situation, we will write $x \vee y$ for the $\preccurlyeq$-least common upper bound of $x, y \in M$ if it exists, and we write $x \wedge y$ for their $\preccurlyeq$-greatest common lower

bound if it exists. If $x, y \in M$ admit a $\preccurlyeq$-least common upper bound, we define $x\backslash y$ as the unique element of M satisfying $x(x\backslash y) = x \vee y$.

Similarly, if M is a right-cancellative atomic monoid, we will write $x \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} y$ and $x \mathbin{\widetilde{\wedge}} y$ for the $\succcurlyeq$-least common upper bound respectively the $\succcurlyeq$-greatest common lower bound of x and y if they exist, and if x and y admit a $\succcurlyeq$-least common upper bound, we define y/x as the unique element of M satisfying $(y/x)x = x \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} y$.

If (M, Δ) is a Garside structure, we write $\mathcal{D}_M$ for the set of simple elements $\mathrm{Div}(\Delta)$, and we define the set of *proper* simple elements as $\mathcal{D}_M^\circ = \mathcal{D}_M \smallsetminus \{\mathbf{1}, \Delta\}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the identity element of M. To avoid clutter, we will usually drop the subscript if there is no danger of confusion. For $x \in \mathcal{D}$, there exists a unique element $\partial x = \partial_M x \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $x\partial x = \Delta$. Clearly, $\partial x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$ iff $x \in \mathcal{D}^\circ$. Moreover, for $x \in M$, we define $\Delta_x := \Delta_x^M := \bigvee\{y\backslash x : y \in M\}$.

Given a set X we will write $X^* = \bigcup_{i=0}^\infty X^i$ for the set of strings of elements of X. We will write ε for the empty string and separate the letters of a string with dots, for example we will write $a \,.\, b \,.\, a \in \{a, b\}^*$.

Given a (quasi)-Garside structure (M, Δ) we can define the *left normal form* of an element by repeatedly extracting the $\preccurlyeq$-GCD of the element and Δ. More precisely, the normal form of $x \in M$ is the unique word $\mathrm{NF}(x) = x_1 \,.\, x_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, x_\ell$ in $(\mathcal{D} \smallsetminus \{\mathbf{1}\})^*$ such that $x = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_\ell$ and $x_i = \Delta \wedge x_i x_{i+1} \cdots x_\ell$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, or equivalently, $\partial x_{i-1} \wedge x_i = \mathbf{1}$ for $i = 2, \ldots, \ell$. We write $x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_\ell$ for the word $x_1 \,.\, x_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, x_\ell$ together with the proposition that this word is in normal form.

If $x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_\ell$ is the normal form of $x \in M$, we define the *infimum* of x as $\inf(x) = \max\{i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell\} : x_i = \Delta\}$, the *supremum* of x as $\sup(x) = \ell$, and the *canonical length* of x as $\mathrm{cl}(x) = \sup(x) - \inf(x)$. Note that $\inf(x)$ is the largest integer i such that $\Delta^i \preccurlyeq x$ holds, and $\sup(x)$ is the smallest integer i such that $x \preccurlyeq \Delta^i$ holds.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the language on the set $\mathcal{D}^\circ$ of proper simple elements consisting of all words in normal form, and write $\mathcal{L}^{(n)}$ for the subset consisting of words of length n:

$$\mathcal{L} := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{L}^{(n)} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{L}^{(n)} := \left\{x_1 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, x_n \in \left(\mathcal{D}^\circ\right)^* : \forall i,\ \partial x_i \wedge x_{i+1} = \mathbf{1}\right\}$$

We also define

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}} := \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(n)} \quad \text{where} \quad \overline{\mathcal{L}}^{(n)} := \left\{x_1 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, x_n \in (\mathcal{D} \smallsetminus \{\mathbf{1}\})^* : \forall i,\ \partial x_i \wedge x_{i+1} = \mathbf{1}\right\}.$$

Definition 4. Let M be a Garside monoid with set of atoms $\mathcal{A}$, let δ be a balanced simple element of M, and let M_δ be the submonoid of M generated by $\{a \in \mathcal{A} : a \preccurlyeq \delta\}$.

M_δ is a *parabolic submonoid* of M, if $\{x \in M : x \preccurlyeq \delta\} = \mathcal{D} \cap M_\delta$ holds.

Proposition 5 ([God07, Lemma 2.1])**.** *If M is a Garside monoid and δ is a balanced simple element of M such that M_δ is a parabolic submonoid of M, then M_δ is a sublattice of M for both $\preccurlyeq$ and $\succcurlyeq$ that is closed under the operations $\backslash$ and $/$. In particular, M_δ is a Garside monoid with Garside element δ.*

Remark. If M_δ is a parabolic submonoid of M, then for any $x \in M_\delta$, the left normal form of x in the Garside monoid M_δ coincides with its left normal form of x in the Garside monoid M.

Definition 6. For a Garside monoid M with set of atoms $\mathcal{A}$ we define the *quasi-centre* of M as $\mathrm{QZ} := \mathrm{QZ}_M := \{u \in M : \mathcal{A}u = u\mathcal{A}\}$, and we say that M is Δ-*pure* if $\Delta_a = \Delta_b$ holds for any $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proposition 7 ([Pic01])**.** *Let M be a Garside monoid with set of atoms $\mathcal{A}$.*

(a) For any $x \in M$ and $c \in \mathrm{QZ}$, one has $x \preccurlyeq c \iff c \succcurlyeq x \iff x \dot{\curlyvee} c$.

(b) For any $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, one has either $\Delta_a = \Delta_b$ or $\Delta_a \wedge \Delta_b = \mathbf{1}$.

(c) If $c_1, c_2 \in \mathrm{QZ}$, then $c_1 \wedge c_2 \in \mathrm{QZ}$.

(d) For any $x \in M$, one has $\Delta_x = \bigwedge(\mathrm{QZ} \cap xM)$. In particular, $\Delta_x \in \mathrm{QZ}$ and $x \preccurlyeq \Delta_x$.

(e) For any $x, y \in M$, one has $\Delta_{x \vee y} = \Delta_x \vee \Delta_y$.

(f) QZ is a free abelian monoid with basis $\{\Delta_a : a \in \mathcal{A}\}$.

Proof. The claims hold by [Pic01, Lemma 1.7, Lemma 2.9, Lemma 2.11, Proposition 2.12, Lemma 2.14, Proposition 2.15]. □

Remark. The results from [Pic01] used in the proof of Proposition 7 do not depend on the notion of crossed products.

We will only consider the prefix lattice, but the left-right symmetry of our definitions means that analogous results hold for the suffix ordering and the right normal form; cf. Lemma 9.

3 Actions on the factors of Zappa-Szép products

In the situation of Definition 1, the process of rewriting the GH-decomposition of an element into its HG-decomposition, or vice versa, defines a left-action and a right-action of H on G, as well as a left-action and a right-action of G on H. This section is devoted to analysing these actions.

Definition 8. Converting HG-decompositions into GH-decompositions, and vice versa, gives us the following maps:

$$\begin{aligned} H \times G &\longrightarrow G & H \times G &\longrightarrow H \\ (h, g) &\longmapsto h \triangleright g & (h, g) &\longmapsto h \triangleleft g \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} G \times H &\longrightarrow H & G \times H &\longrightarrow G \\ (g, h) &\longmapsto g \blacktriangleright h & (g, h) &\longmapsto g \blacktriangleleft h \end{aligned}$$

such that $hg = (h \triangleright g)(h \triangleleft g)$ and $gh = (g \blacktriangleright h)(g \blacktriangleleft h)$.

These definitions correspond to the following commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & g \blacktriangleright h & \\ g & \square & g \blacktriangleleft h \\ & h & \end{array} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} & h & \\ h \triangleright g & \square & g \\ & h \triangleleft g & \end{array}$$

3.1 Basic properties

We start by noting some basic properties of these actions.

Lemma 9. *Consider the set of propositions built out of monoid operations, logical operations, quantifiers over G, H and K, and the operations $\triangleright$, $\triangleleft$, $\blacktriangleright$, $\blacktriangleleft$. We can define two transformations of this set as follows.*

- σ : *Swap $G \longleftrightarrow H$, $\triangleright \longleftrightarrow \blacktriangleright$ and $\triangleleft \longleftrightarrow \blacktriangleleft$.*
- τ : *Replace the monoids with their opposites, reversing all monoid expressions and all triangle operations:*
  - $G \longrightarrow G^{\mathrm{op}}$, $H \longrightarrow H^{\mathrm{op}}$ *and* $K \longrightarrow K^{\mathrm{op}}$.
  - $x \cdot y \longrightarrow y^{\mathrm{op}} \cdot x^{\mathrm{op}}$.
  - $h \triangleright g \longleftrightarrow g^{\mathrm{op}} \blacktriangleleft h^{\mathrm{op}}$ *and* $h \triangleleft g \longleftrightarrow g^{\mathrm{op}} \blacktriangleright h^{\mathrm{op}}$.

Then for any proposition E we have $E \iff \sigma(E) \iff \tau(E)$.

Proof. The equivalence of E and $\sigma(E)$ is clear; if you swap the roles of G and H then you swap the definitions of the triangle operations.

To see that E is equivalent to $\tau(E)$, first observe that $K = G \bowtie H$ if and only if $K^{\mathrm{op}} = G^{\mathrm{op}} \bowtie H^{\mathrm{op}}$. The anti-isomorphisms between K and K^{op} transforms the equality $hg = (h \triangleright g)(h \triangleleft g)$ to

$$g^{\mathrm{op}}h^{\mathrm{op}} = (h \triangleleft g)^{\mathrm{op}}(h \triangleright g)^{\mathrm{op}},$$

but taking $H^{\mathrm{op}}G^{\mathrm{op}}$-decompositions gives us

$$g^{\mathrm{op}}h^{\mathrm{op}} = (g^{\mathrm{op}} \blacktriangleright h^{\mathrm{op}})(g^{\mathrm{op}} \blacktriangleleft h^{\mathrm{op}}).$$

The uniqueness of $H^{\mathrm{op}}G^{\mathrm{op}}$-decompositions means we have the following equalities.

$$(h \triangleleft g)^{\mathrm{op}} = (g^{\mathrm{op}} \blacktriangleright h^{\mathrm{op}}) \qquad (h \triangleright g)^{\mathrm{op}} = (g^{\mathrm{op}} \blacktriangleleft h^{\mathrm{op}}) \tag{1}$$

If E is simply an equality between two monoid-triangle expressions, i.e E is $x = y$, then by (1) $\tau(x) = x^{\mathrm{op}}$ and $\tau(y) = y^{\mathrm{op}}$ so the equivalence of E and $\tau(E)$ follows from the fact that op is a bijection.

Logical conjunction and disjunction and the universal and existential quantifiers are unchanged by τ, e.g. $\tau(A \wedge B) \equiv \tau(A) \wedge \tau(B)$. Therefore, the equivalence of E and $\tau(E)$ follows by structural induction. □

Lemma 10. *The maps $\triangleright$ and $\blacktriangleright$ define left actions, and $\triangleleft$ and $\blacktriangleleft$ define right actions.*

$$\begin{aligned} (h_1h_2) \triangleright g &= h_1 \triangleright (h_2 \triangleright g) & (g_1g_2) \blacktriangleright h &= g_1 \blacktriangleright (g_2 \blacktriangleright h) \\ h \triangleleft (g_1g_2) &= (h \triangleleft g_1) \triangleleft g_2 & g \blacktriangleleft (h_1h_2) &= (g \blacktriangleleft h_1) \blacktriangleleft h_2 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the actions act on products as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} h \triangleright (g_1g_2) &= (h \triangleright g_1)((h \triangleleft g_1) \triangleright g_2) \\ g \blacktriangleright (h_1h_2) &= (g \blacktriangleright h_1)((g \blacktriangleleft h_1) \blacktriangleright h_2) \\ (h_1h_2) \triangleleft g &= (h_1 \triangleleft (h_2 \triangleright g))(h_2 \triangleleft g) \\ (g_1g_2) \blacktriangleleft h &= (g_1 \blacktriangleleft (g_2 \blacktriangleright h))(g_2 \blacktriangleleft h) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Proof. Consider the following commutative diagram:



We have

$$\begin{aligned}(h_1h_2)g &= \big((h_1h_2) \triangleright g\big)\big((h_1h_2) \triangleleft g\big)\\ h_1(h_2g) &= h_1(h_2 \triangleright g)(h_2 \triangleleft g)\\ &= \big(h_1 \triangleright (h_2 \triangleright g)\big)\big(h_1 \triangleleft (h_2 \triangleright g)\big)(h_2 \triangleleft g)\ ,\end{aligned}$$

so by the uniqueness of GH-decompositions,

$$\begin{aligned}(h_1h_2) \triangleright g &= h_1 \triangleright (h_2 \triangleright g)\\ (h_1h_2) \triangleleft g &= \big(h_1 \triangleleft (h_2 \triangleright g)\big)(h_2 \triangleleft g)\ .\end{aligned}$$

The other equalities follow by Lemma 9. □

Lemma 11. *The identity elements of the submonoids act trivially.*

$$\mathbf{1} \triangleright g = g \qquad h \triangleleft \mathbf{1} = h \qquad \mathbf{1} \blacktriangleright h = h \qquad g \blacktriangleleft \mathbf{1} = g$$

Proof. This is obvious from the definition and the uniqueness of GH- and HG-decompositions. □

Lemma 12. *For all $g \in G$, $h \in H$ we have the following logical equivalences.*

$$\begin{aligned} g = \mathbf{1} &\iff h \triangleright g = \mathbf{1} & \qquad h = \mathbf{1} &\iff h \triangleleft g = \mathbf{1}\\ h = \mathbf{1} &\iff g \blacktriangleright h = \mathbf{1} & \qquad g = \mathbf{1} &\iff g \blacktriangleleft h = \mathbf{1}\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Consider the equation $hg = (h \triangleright g)(h \triangleleft g)$. If $g = \mathbf{1}$ then this is an element of H, so by the uniqueness of GH-decompositions $h \triangleright g = \mathbf{1}$. Similarly, if $h \triangleright g = \mathbf{1}$ then this is also an element of H, so by the uniqueness of HG-decompositions $g = \mathbf{1}$.

The remaining equivalences follow by Lemma 9. □

Lemma 13. *For all $g \in G$ and $h \in H$:*

$$\begin{aligned}(g \blacktriangleright h) \triangleright (g \blacktriangleleft h) &= g & \qquad (g \blacktriangleright h) \triangleleft (g \blacktriangleleft h) &= h\\ (h \triangleright g) \blacktriangleright (h \triangleleft g) &= h & \qquad (h \triangleright g) \blacktriangleleft (h \triangleleft g) &= g\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Rewriting a GH-decomposition as a HG- and then back as a GH-decomposition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}gh &= (g \blacktriangleright h)(g \blacktriangleleft h)\\ &= \big((g \blacktriangleright h) \triangleright (g \blacktriangleleft h)\big)\big((g \blacktriangleright h) \triangleleft (g \blacktriangleleft h)\big)\ .\end{aligned}$$



By the uniqueness of GH-decompositions we can the deduce the first two equations. The second two can be shown in the same way. □

3.2 Actions and the monoid structure

Definition 14. A monoid M is *conical* if for all $x, y \in M$, $xy = \mathbf{1}$ implies that $x = \mathbf{1} = y$. In particular, all Garside monoids are conical.

Lemma 15. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ and that H is conical. Then, for all $x, y \in K$, $xy \in G$ implies that $x \in G$ and $y \in G$.*

Proof. Let $g = xy \in G$. Suppose that we have the following GH-decompositions of x and y.

$$x = g_x h_x \qquad\qquad y = g_y h_y$$

Now

$$g = xy = g_x h_x g_y h_y = g_x (h_x \triangleright g_y)(h_x \triangleleft g_y) h_y$$

By the uniqueness of the GH-decomposition of g, we have the following.

$$g = g_x (h_x \triangleright g_y) \qquad\qquad \mathbf{1} = (h_x \triangleleft g_y) h_y$$

So, as H is conical, $h_x \triangleleft g_y = \mathbf{1} = h_y$ and so, by Lemma 12, $h_x = \mathbf{1}$. Hence $x = g_x \in G$ and $y = g_y \in G$. □

Lemma 16. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ and that H is conical. For all $h \in H$ we have that if $a \in G$ is an atom then $h \triangleright a$ is an atom.*

Proof. Suppose that $h \triangleright a = xy$, that is, $ha = xyh'$ where $h' = h \triangleleft a$. By Lemma 15, $x, y \in G$, so we may apply Lemma 10 to the action of h' on xy, which gives us

$$a = (xy) \blacktriangleleft h' = (x \blacktriangleleft (y \blacktriangleright h'))(y \blacktriangleleft h') \,.$$

Now if a is an atom, we have that either $(x \blacktriangleleft (y \blacktriangleright h')) = \mathbf{1}$ or $(y \blacktriangleleft h') = \mathbf{1}$. So, by Lemma 12, either $x = \mathbf{1}$ or $y = \mathbf{1}$ holds. □

Lemma 17. *If $h \triangleleft g = h$ then, for all ℓ, $h \triangleright (g^\ell) = (h \triangleright g)^\ell$.*

Proof. Using induction on ℓ, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h \triangleright g^\ell &= h \triangleright (g g^{\ell-1}) = (h \triangleright g)((h \triangleleft g) \triangleright g^{\ell-1}) \\ &= (h \triangleright g)(h \triangleright g^{\ell-1}) = (h \triangleright g)^\ell \,. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 18. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$, that G is left-cancellative and that common multiples with respect to the prefix order exist in G for every pair of elements. Then $\triangleright$ acts by injections.*

Proof. Suppose that $h \triangleright g_1 = h \triangleright g_2$; we have to show that $g_1 = g_2$. Let $g = h \triangleright g_1$. There exist $h_1, h_2 \in H$ such that

$$hg_1 = gh_1 \qquad\qquad hg_2 = gh_2. \tag{3}$$

Let $g_1\bar{g}_1 = g_2\bar{g}_2$ be a common multiple of g_1 and g_2 in G.

$$hg_1\bar{g}_1 = gh_1\bar{g}_1 = g(h_1 \triangleright \bar{g}_1)(h_1 \triangleleft \bar{g}_1)$$
$$hg_2\bar{g}_2 = gh_2\bar{g}_2 = g(h_2 \triangleright \bar{g}_2)(h_2 \triangleleft \bar{g}_2)$$

Uniqueness of GH-decompositions and the left-cancellativity of G give us the following.

$$h_1 \triangleright \bar{g}_1 = h_2 \triangleright \bar{g}_2 \qquad\qquad h_1 \triangleleft \bar{g}_1 = h_2 \triangleleft \bar{g}_2$$

So $h_1\bar{g}_1 = h_2\bar{g}_2$, and uniqueness of HG-decompositions then yields $h_1 = h_2$. Substituting this into (3) gives $hg_1 = hg_2$, and using the uniqueness of HG-decompositions again, we obtain $g_1 = g_2$. □

Lemma 19. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$, that G is atomic and that $\triangleright$ acts surjectively on the set of atoms. Then $\triangleright$ acts surjectively on the whole of G.*

Proof. We need to show that given any $h \in H$ and $g \in G$ there exists $g' \in G$ such that $h \triangleright g' = g$. As G is atomic we may proceed by induction on the length of the longest decomposition of g as a product of atoms.

Suppose that $g = ag_1$ where a is an atom of G. As $\triangleright$ acts surjectively on the set of atoms, there exists an atom $b \in G$ such that $h \triangleright b = a$. The longest atomic decomposition of g_1 must be at least one shorter than that for g, so by induction there exists $g_1' \in G$ such that

$$(h \triangleleft b) \triangleright g_1' = g_1.$$

Now

$$h \triangleright (bg_1') = (h \triangleright b)((h \triangleleft b) \triangleright g_1') = ag_1 = g.$$

So $g' = bg_1'$ is the required element of G. □

Lemma 20. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$, that G and H are left-cancellative and that $\triangleright$ acts by injections. Then K is left-cancellative.*

Proof. Suppose we have $x, y_1, y_2 \in K$ such that $xy_1 = xy_2$. We have GH-decompositions $x = g_xh_x$, $y_1 = g_1h_1$ and $y_2 = g_2h_2$.

$$g_x \underbrace{h_xg_1}\, h_1 = g_x(h_x \triangleright g_1)(h_x \triangleleft g_1)h_1$$
$$g_x \underbrace{h_xg_2}\, h_2 = g_x(h_x \triangleright g_2)(h_x \triangleleft g_2)h_2$$

Uniqueness of GH-decompositions means that

$$g_x(h_x \triangleright g_1) = g_x(h_x \triangleright g_2)$$
$$(h_x \triangleleft g_1)h_1 = (h_x \triangleleft g_2)h_2$$

Now, left-cancellativity of G implies that $h_x \triangleright g_1 = h_x \triangleright g_2$. So, as $\triangleright$ acts injectively $g_1 = g_2$. So, left-cancellativity of H then implies that $h_1 = h_2$. Hence $y_1 = y_2$. □

3.3 Submonoids acting by bijections

We will see in Section 4 that in the situations we are interested in the submonoids act on each other by bijections. We analyse this special case in the remainder of this section.

Definition 21. Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$. We say that the submonoids act on each other by bijections, if for all $h \in H$ the maps

$$g \mapsto h \triangleright g \qquad \text{and} \qquad g \mapsto g \blacktriangleleft h$$

and for all $g \in G$ the maps

$$h \mapsto h \triangleleft g \qquad \text{and} \qquad h \mapsto g \blacktriangleright h$$

are bijections.

In this case, we denote the inverses of these maps as follows:

$$g \mapsto h^{-1} \triangleright g := (g \mapsto h \triangleright g)^{-1} \qquad h \mapsto h \triangleleft g^{-1} := (h \mapsto h \triangleleft g)^{-1}$$
$$h \mapsto g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h := (h \mapsto g \blacktriangleright h)^{-1} \qquad g \mapsto g \blacktriangleleft h^{-1} := (g \mapsto g \triangleleft h)^{-1}$$

Obviously there are no *elements* g^{-1} and h^{-1}; this is just a notational convenience.

Lemma 22. *If $K = G \bowtie H$ and the submonoids act on each other by bijections then, for all $g \in G$ and $h \in H$,*

$$h \triangleleft (h^{-1} \triangleright g) = g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h \qquad (h \triangleleft g^{-1}) \triangleright g = g \blacktriangleleft h^{-1}$$
$$g \blacktriangleleft (g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h) = h^{-1} \triangleright g \qquad (g \blacktriangleleft h^{-1}) \blacktriangleright h = h \triangleleft g^{-1}$$

Proof. Suppose $g' = h^{-1} \triangleright g$. So $h \triangleright g' = g$ and $hg' = gh'$ for some $h' \in H$. From this we see that $h \triangleleft g' = h'$ and $g \blacktriangleright h' = h$. Substituting for g' in the former and rearranging the latter we have $h \triangleleft (h^{-1} \triangleright g) = h' = g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h$. Hence the first equation holds.

The remaining equations are shown in an analogous fashion. □

Lemma 23. *If $K = G \bowtie H$ and the submonoids act on each other by bijections then, for all $g, g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $h, h_1, h_2 \in H$, the following identities hold:*

$$(h_1h_2)^{-1} \triangleright g = h_2^{-1} \triangleright (h_1^{-1} \triangleright g) \qquad (g_1g_2)^{-1} \blacktriangleright h = g_2^{-1} \blacktriangleright (g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)$$
$$h \triangleleft (g_1g_2)^{-1} = (h \triangleleft g_2^{-1}) \triangleleft g_1^{-1} \qquad g \blacktriangleleft (h_1h_2)^{-1} = (g \blacktriangleleft h_2^{-1}) \blacktriangleleft h_1^{-1}$$

$$h^{-1} \triangleright (g_1g_2) = (h^{-1} \triangleright g_1)\left((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)^{-1} \triangleright g_2\right)$$
$$g^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1h_2) = (g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1)\left((h_1^{-1} \triangleright g)^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_2\right)$$
$$(h_1h_2) \triangleleft g^{-1} = \left(h_1 \triangleleft (g \blacktriangleleft h_2^{-1})^{-1}\right)(h_2 \triangleleft g^{-1})$$
$$(g_1g_2) \blacktriangleleft h^{-1} = \left(g_1 \blacktriangleleft (h \triangleleft g_2^{-1})^{-1}\right)(g_2 \blacktriangleleft h^{-1})$$

Proof. The first set of equations clearly hold as $\triangleright$, $\triangleleft$, $\blacktriangleright$ and $\blacktriangleleft$ define actions.

Now consider the first of the second set of equations. If we apply h we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} h \rhd \Big((h^{-1} \rhd g_1)\big((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)^{-1} \rhd g_2\big)\Big) & \\ &= g_1 \Big(\big(h \lhd (h^{-1} \rhd g_1)\big) \rhd \big((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)^{-1} \rhd g_2\big)\Big) && \text{by Lemma 10} \\ &= g_1 \Big((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h) \rhd \big((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)^{-1} \rhd g_2\big)\Big) && \text{by Lemma 22} \\ &= g_1 g_2 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, as required, $h^{-1} \rhd g_1 g_2 = (h^{-1} \rhd g_1)\left((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)^{-1} \rhd g_2\right)$.

The other equations can be shown in the same way. □

Proposition 24. *Suppose $K = G \bowtie H$, that G and H are cancellative, and that G and H act on each other by bijections.*

Then for all $g \in G$ and $h \in H$, the left actions are isomorphisms of the prefix order and the right actions are isomorphisms of the suffix order:

$$\begin{aligned} h \rhd \cdot &: (G, \preccurlyeq_G) \xrightarrow{\sim} (G, \preccurlyeq_G) & \qquad \cdot \lhd g &: (H, \succcurlyeq_H) \xrightarrow{\sim} (H, \succcurlyeq_H) \\ g \blacktriangleright \cdot &: (H, \preccurlyeq_H) \xrightarrow{\sim} (H, \preccurlyeq_H) & \qquad \cdot \blacktriangleleft h &: (G, \succcurlyeq_G) \xrightarrow{\sim} (G, \succcurlyeq_G) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Lemma 10 implies that these maps are poset morphisms: For example, if $g_1 \preccurlyeq_G g'$ then there exists g_2 such that $g' = g_1 g_2$, whence we obtain $h \rhd g' = (h \rhd g_1)\left((h \lhd g_1) \rhd g_2\right)$ and so $h \rhd g_1 \preccurlyeq_G h \rhd g'$.

Similarly, Lemma 23 implies that the inverses of these maps are poset morphisms: For example, if $g_1 \preccurlyeq_G g'$ then there exists g_2 such that $g' = g_1 g_2$. Hence one has $h^{-1} \rhd g' = (h^{-1} \rhd g_1)\left((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)^{-1} \rhd g_2\right)$ and $h^{-1} \rhd g_1 \preccurlyeq_G h^{-1} \rhd g'$. □

Lemma 25. *Suppose $K = G \bowtie H$, that G and H are cancellative, and that G and H act on each other by bijections.*

Then for all $g_1, g_2 \in G$ such that $g_1 \vee g_2$ exists in H and all $h \in H$ one has the following:

$$h \rhd (g_1 \backslash g_2) = \left(g_1 \blacktriangleleft h^{-1}\right) \setminus \left(\left(h \lhd g_1^{-1}\right) \rhd g_2\right)$$

$$h^{-1} \rhd (g_1 \backslash g_2) = \left(g_1 \blacktriangleleft h\right) \setminus \left((g_1 \blacktriangleright h)^{-1} \rhd g_2\right)$$

Proof. For any $h' \in H$, one has $h' \rhd (g_1 \vee g_2) = (h' \rhd g_1) \vee (h' \rhd g_2)$ by Proposition 24. On the other hand, using Lemma 10, one has $h' \rhd (g_1 \vee g_2) = h' \rhd \big(g_1 (g_1 \backslash g_2)\big) = (h' \rhd g_1)\big((h' \lhd g_1) \rhd (g_1 \backslash g_2)\big)$. As G is cancellative, these imply $(h' \rhd g_1) \backslash (h' \rhd g_2) = (h' \lhd g_1) \rhd (g_1 \backslash g_2)$. The first claim follows setting $h' = h \lhd g_1^{-1}$ and simplifying $(h \lhd g_1^{-1}) \rhd g_1 = g_1 \blacktriangleleft h^{-1}$ using Lemma 22.

The second claim is shown in the same way, using Lemma 23 instead of Lemma 10. □

Lemma 26. *Suppose $K = G \bowtie H$, that G and H are cancellative and conical, and that G and H act on each other by injections.*

Then $(K, \preccurlyeq_K)$ and $(K, \succcurlyeq_K)$ are posets, and the restrictions of $\preccurlyeq_K$ and $\succcurlyeq_K$ to $G \times G$ and $H \times H$ coincide with $\preccurlyeq_G$, $\succcurlyeq_G$, $\preccurlyeq_H$ and $\succcurlyeq_H$ respectively:

$$\preccurlyeq_{K|_{G\times G}} = \preccurlyeq_G \qquad \succcurlyeq_{K|_{G\times G}} = \succcurlyeq_G$$

$$\preccurlyeq_{K|_{H\times H}} = \preccurlyeq_H \qquad \succcurlyeq_{K|_{H\times H}} = \succcurlyeq_H$$

Proof. By Lemma 20 and Lemma 9, the monoid K is cancellative, hence $\preccurlyeq$ and $\succcurlyeq$ define partial orders.

Lemma 15 implies that G and H are closed under $\dot{\curlyvee}$, which implies the rest of the claim. For instance, if $g_1 \preccurlyeq_K g_2$ holds for $g_1, g_2 \in G$, then there exists $x \in K$ such that $g_1 x = g_2$. As G is closed under $\dot{\curlyvee}$, one has $x \in G$ and thus $g_1 \preccurlyeq_G g_2$. Conversely, $g_1 \preccurlyeq_G g_2$ trivially implies $g_1 \preccurlyeq_K g_2$. □

In the situation of Lemma 26, we will in the following just write $\preccurlyeq$ and $\succcurlyeq$ instead of $\preccurlyeq_K$, $\succcurlyeq_K$, $\preccurlyeq_G$, $\succcurlyeq_G$, $\preccurlyeq_H$ and $\succcurlyeq_H$.

Proposition 27. *Suppose $K = G \bowtie H$, that G and H are cancellative and conical, and that G and H act on each other by bijections.*

Then for all $g \in G$ and $h \in H$, we have

$$g \vee h = gh' = hg' = g' \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} h'$$

where $h' = g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h$ and $g' = h^{-1} \triangleright g$. Moreover, if $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$ satisfy $g_1 \vee h_1 = g_2 \vee h_2$ or $g_1 \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} h_1 = g_2 \vee h_2$, then $g_1 = g_2$ and $h_1 = h_2$.

Proof. We are in the situation of Lemma 26.

First we will show that $gh' = hg'$. As $h' = g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h$, we have $g \blacktriangleright h' = h$ and, using Lemma 22, $gh' = h(g \blacktriangleleft h') = h(g \blacktriangleleft (g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)) = h(h^{-1} \triangleright g) = hg'$. Therefore, $gh' = hg'$ is a common upper bound of g and h with respect to $\preccurlyeq$.

Now assume we have $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$ such that $gh_1g_1 = hg_2h_2$ is a common upper bound of g and h with respect to $\preccurlyeq$. As we have

$$gh_1g_1 = g(h_1 \triangleright g_1)(h_1 \triangleleft g_1) \quad \text{and}$$
$$hg_2h_2 = (h \triangleright g_2)(h \triangleleft g_2)h_2 \,,$$

uniqueness of GH-decompositions implies that $g(h_1 \triangleright g_1) = (h \triangleright g_2)$. Acting by h^{-1} on both sides of this equality and applying Lemma 23, we obtain $g' = h^{-1} \triangleright g \preccurlyeq g_2$, and thus $hg' \preccurlyeq hg_2 \preccurlyeq hg_2h_2$.

The claims for $\widetilde{\vee}$ are analogous. □

Theorem 28. *Suppose $K = G \bowtie H$, that G and H are cancellative and conical, and that G and H act on each other by bijections.*

The map $G \times H \to K$ given by $(g, h) \mapsto g \vee h$ is a poset isomorphism $(G, \preccurlyeq_G) \times (H, \preccurlyeq_H) \to (K, \preccurlyeq_K)$.

Similarly, the map $G \times H \to K$ given by $(g, h) \mapsto g \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} h$ is a poset isomorphism $(G, \succcurlyeq_G) \times (H, \succcurlyeq_H) \to (K, \succcurlyeq_K)$.

Proof. We are in the situation of Lemma 26, so we will drop the subscripts of the partial orders.

Given any $x \in K$ we can write $x = g_1h_1 = h_2g_2$ where g_1h_1 and h_2g_2 are the GH-, respectively, HG-decompositions of x. By Proposition 27, $x = g_1 \vee h_2$, therefore the map is invertible.

Claim. If $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$ are such that $g_1 \preccurlyeq g_2$ and $h_1 \preccurlyeq h_2$ then $g_1 \vee h_1 \preccurlyeq g_2 \vee h_2$.

If $g_1 \preccurlyeq g_2$ and $h_1 \preccurlyeq h_2$, then there are $g_3 \in G$ and $h_3 \in H$ such that $g_1 g_3 = g_2$ and $h_1 h_3 = h_2$. Now consider the following, where $g_1 \vee h_1 = g_1 h_1' = h_1 g_1'$:

$$\begin{aligned}(g_1 \vee h_1)\left((h_1'^{-1} \rhd g_3) \vee (g_1'^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)\right) \\ = g_1 h_1' (h_1'^{-1} \rhd g_3)\left((h_1'^{-1} \rhd g_3)^{-1} \blacktriangleright (g_1'^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)\right) \\ = \underbrace{g_1 g_3}_{\in G} \underbrace{\left(h_1' \lhd (h_1'^{-1} \rhd g_3)\right)\left((h_1'^{-1} \rhd g_3)^{-1} \blacktriangleright (g_1'^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)\right)}_{\in H}\end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned}(g_1 \vee h_1)\left((h_1'^{-1} \rhd g_3) \vee (g_1'^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)\right) \\ = h_1 g_1' (g_1'^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)\left((g_1'^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)^{-1} \rhd (h_1'^{-1} \rhd g_3)\right) \\ = \underbrace{h_1 h_3}_{\in H} \underbrace{\left(g_1' \blacktriangleleft (g_1'^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)\right)\left((g_1'^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)^{-1} \rhd (h_1'^{-1} \rhd g_3)\right)}_{\in G}\end{aligned}$$

By the uniqueness of GH- and HG-decompositions and Proposition 27, we thus have $(g_1 \vee h_1)\left((h_1'^{-1} \rhd g_3) \vee (g_1'^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)\right) = g_1 g_3 \vee h_1 h_3 = g_2 \vee h_2$. Hence $g_1 \vee h_1 \preccurlyeq g_2 \vee h_2$ and so the claim holds.

Claim. If $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$ are such that $g_1 \vee h_1 \preccurlyeq g_2 \vee h_2$ then $g_1 \preccurlyeq g_2$ and $h_1 \preccurlyeq h_2$.

Suppose that $g_1 \vee h_1 \preccurlyeq g_2 \vee h_2$, so there exists $g_3 \in G$ and $h_3 \in H$ such that $(g_1 \vee h_1)(g_3 \vee h_3) = g_2 \vee h_2$.

Now consider the following.

$$\begin{aligned}(g_1 \vee h_1)(g_3 \vee h_3) &= g_1 (g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1) g_3 (g_3^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3) \\ &= \underbrace{g_1 \left((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1) \rhd g_3\right)}_{\in G} \underbrace{\left((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1) \lhd g_3\right)(g_3^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_3)}_{\in H}\end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}(g_1 \vee h_1)(g_3 \vee h_3) &= h_1 (h_1^{-1} \rhd g_1) h_3 (h_3^{-1} \rhd g_3) \\ &= \underbrace{h_1 \left((h_1^{-1} \rhd g_1) \blacktriangleright h_3\right)}_{\in H} \underbrace{\left((h_1^{-1} \rhd g_1) \blacktriangleleft h_3\right)(h_3^{-1} \rhd g_3)}_{\in G}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(g_1 \vee h_1)(g_3 \vee h_3) = g_1 \left((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1) \rhd g_3\right) \vee h_1 \left((h_1^{-1} \rhd g_1) \blacktriangleright h_3\right)$. So $g_2 = g_1 \left((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1) \rhd g_3\right)$ and $h_2 = h_1 \left((h_1^{-1} \rhd g_1) \blacktriangleright h_3\right)$. Hence $g_1 \preccurlyeq g_2$ and $h_1 \preccurlyeq h_2$ and so the claim holds.

We have shown that the map $(g, h) \mapsto g \vee h$ is invertible and that both this map and its inverse preserve the ordering. Therefore it is an isomorphism between the respective posets.

The claim for the map $(g, h) \mapsto g \,\widetilde{\vee}\, h$ is shown analogously. □

Remark. An equivalent result for crossed products is [Pic01, Prop. 3.12].

Lemma 29. *Suppose $K = G \bowtie H$, that G and H are cancellative and conical, and that G and H act on each other by bijections.*

Then, for all $g_1, g_2 \in G$ such that $g_1 \vee g_2 \in G$ exists and for all $h_1, h_2 \in H$ such that $h_1 \vee h_2 \in K$ exists, the elements $g_1 \vee h_1$ and $g_2 \vee h_2$ of K admit a $\preccurlyeq$-least common upper bound in K, and one has

$$(g_1 \vee h_1)\backslash(g_2 \vee h_2) = \Big(\big(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1\big)^{-1} \triangleright (g_1\backslash g_2)\Big) \vee \Big(\big(h_1^{-1} \triangleright g_1\big)^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1\backslash h_2)\Big).$$

Proof. Let $g' = g_1\backslash g_2$ and $h' = h_1\backslash h_2$, so $g_1 \vee g_2 = g_1 g'$ and $h_1 \vee h_2 = h_1 h'$. Using Theorem 28, Proposition 27, Lemma 22 and Lemma 23, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(g_1 \vee h_1) \vee (g_2 \vee h_2) &= (g_1 \vee g_2) \vee (h_1 \vee h_2) = g_1 g'\Big((g_1 g')^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1 h')\Big) \\
&= g_1 g'\Big(g'^{-1} \blacktriangleright \big(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1 h')\big)\Big) \\
&= g_1\big(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1 h')\big)\Big(g' \blacktriangleleft \Big(g'^{-1} \blacktriangleright \big(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1 h')\big)\Big)\Big) \\
&= \underbrace{g_1\big(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1\big)}_{=g_1 \vee h_1} \underbrace{\Big(\big(h_1^{-1} \triangleright g_1\big)^{-1} \blacktriangleright h'\Big)}_{\in H} \underbrace{\Big(\big(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1 h')\big)^{-1} \triangleright g'\Big)}_{\in G}
\end{aligned}$$

Likewise,

$$\begin{aligned}
(g_1 \vee h_1) \vee (g_2 \vee h_2) &= (g_1 \vee g_2) \vee (h_1 \vee h_2) = h_1 h'\Big((h_1 h')^{-1} \triangleright (g_1 g')\Big) \\
&= h_1 h'\Big(h'^{-1} \triangleright \big(h_1^{-1} \triangleright (g_1 g')\big)\Big) \\
&= h_1\big(h_1^{-1} \triangleright (g_1 g')\big)\Big(h' \triangleleft \Big(h'^{-1} \triangleright \big(h_1^{-1} \triangleright (g_1 g')\big)\Big)\Big) \\
&= \underbrace{h_1\big(h_1^{-1} \triangleright g_1\big)}_{=g_1 \vee h_1} \underbrace{\Big(\big(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1\big)^{-1} \triangleright g'\Big)}_{\in G} \underbrace{\Big(\big(h_1^{-1} \triangleright (g_1 g')\big)^{-1} \blacktriangleright h'\Big)}_{\in H}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, as K is cancelative, applying Proposition 27 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&(g_1 \vee h_1) \vee (g_2 \vee h_2) = \\
&\qquad (g_1 \vee h_1)\Big(\Big(\big(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1\big)^{-1} \triangleright (g_1\backslash g_2)\Big) \vee \Big(\big(h_1^{-1} \triangleright g_1\big)^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1\backslash h_2)\Big)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

□

4 Actions in the case of Garside monoids

In this section, we analyse the actions of the factors of a Zappa-Szép product on one another in the case that the product is a Garside monoid, or that both of the factors are Garside monoids. Using these results, we prove that a Zappa-Szép product $K = G \bowtie H$ of monoids is a Garside monoid if and only if both G and H are Garside monoids.

Lemma 30. *If $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside monoid then the submonoids act on each other by bijections.*

Proof. We will first show that the maps are injective. So suppose that $h \rhd g_1 = h \rhd g_2 = g$; we need to show that $g_1 = g_2$.

Let $h_1 = h \lhd g_1$ and $h_2 = h \lhd g_2$. So we have

$$hg_1 = gh_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad hg_2 = gh_2 \tag{4}$$

First consider the case when $g_1 \wedge g_2 = \mathbf{1}$. Taking the GCD of the two elements in (4) gives

$$hg_1 \wedge hg_2 = h(g_1 \wedge g_2) = h \qquad \text{and} \qquad gh_1 \wedge gh_2 = g(h_1 \wedge h_2)\ .$$

Uniqueness of GH-decompositions then implies $g = \mathbf{1}$ (and $h = h_1 \wedge h_2$). Uniqueness the of HG-decompositions in (4) then imply $g_1 = \mathbf{1} = g_2$.

Now suppose that $g_1 \wedge g_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$, so

$$g_1 = (g_1 \wedge g_2)\bar{g}_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad g_2 = (g_1 \wedge g_2)\bar{g}_2$$

for some $\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2 \in G$ with $\bar{g}_1 \wedge \bar{g}_2 = \mathbf{1}$.

We can now apply the formula for the action on a product from Lemma 10:

$$\begin{aligned} h \rhd g_1 &= h \rhd (g_1 \wedge g_2)\bar{g}_1 \\ &= (h \rhd (g_1 \wedge g_2))\,((h \lhd (g_1 \wedge g_2)) \rhd \bar{g}_1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} h \rhd g_2 &= h \rhd (g_1 \wedge g_2)\bar{g}_2 \\ &= (h \rhd (g_1 \wedge g_2))\,((h \lhd (g_1 \wedge g_2)) \rhd \bar{g}_2) \end{aligned}$$

Cancellativity of K means that $h' \rhd \bar{g}_1 = h' \rhd \bar{g}_2$, where $h' = h \lhd (g_1 \wedge g_2)$. As $\bar{g}_1 \wedge \bar{g}_2 = \mathbf{1}$ we can apply the first case to deduce that $\bar{g}_1 = \bar{g}_2$ and so $g_1 = g_2$.

Similar arguments show that the other maps are injective, so it remains to show that the maps are surjective.

First note that, by Lemma 16, the maps take atoms to atoms. So, as the sets of atoms are finite, the maps are bijections on these sets. The surjectivity of the maps then follows from Lemma 19 and Lemma 9. □

Theorem 31. *If $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside monoid then G and H are parabolic submonoids of K. In particular, G and H are Garside monoids.*

Proof. Let $d_G d_H$ and $e_H e_G$ be the GH-, respectively, HG-decompositions of Δ.

Suppose that $x \in \mathcal{D} \cap G$ is a simple element which lies in G. Now, as x is a simple element, there is a ∂x such that $x\partial x = \Delta$. Let gh be the GH-decomposition of ∂x. So we have

$$xgh = \Delta.$$

As $x \in G$, the uniqueness of GH-decompositions means that

$$xg = d_G \qquad \text{and} \qquad h = d_H.$$

Hence x is a prefix of d_G. Since d_G is a simple element and a member of the submonoid G, we have that d_G is the $\preccurlyeq$-LCM of the intersection of $\mathcal{D}$ and G. A similar argument show that e_G is the $\succcurlyeq$-LCM of the same set.

$$d_G = \bigvee(\mathcal{D} \cap G) \qquad\qquad e_G = \widetilde{\bigvee}(\mathcal{D} \cap G) \tag{5}$$

Now observe that $e_G \in \mathcal{D} \cap G$ and hence $e_G \preccurlyeq d_G$. We also have that $d_G \in \mathcal{D} \cap G$ and so $e_G \succcurlyeq d_G$. Together these imply that $d_G = e_G$.

If x is a prefix of d_G then it is a simple element and, by Lemma 15, an element of G. Therefore x is an element of $\mathcal{D} \cap G$. So, by (5), x is a suffix of $e_G = d_G$. Similarly, every suffix of d_G is also a prefix of d_G. Therefore d_G is a balanced element with $\mathrm{Div}(d_G) = \mathcal{D} \cap G$.

Every element of K can be written as a product of atoms, so, by Lemma 15, G is generated by the atoms of K which lie in G. Every atom in G is clearly in $\mathcal{D} \cap G$, hence G is generated by the divisors of d_G. Therefore, G is a parabolic submonoid and d_G is a Garside element.

The same argument with the roles of G and H reversed shows that H is also a parabolic submonoid and that $d_H = e_H$ is a Garside element. □

Remark. The proof of Theorem 31 shows that decomposing a Garside element of a Garside monoid $K = G \bowtie H$ gives Garside elements for G and H. However, not every pair of Garside elements for the submonoids G and H can be produced this way, as Example 33 shows.

Proposition 32. *Let $K = G \bowtie H$ be a Garside monoid and let $g \in G$. Then $\Delta_g^K = \bigvee\{x \backslash g : x \in K\} \in G$.*

Proof. For $x = g_1 \vee h_1$ with $g_1 \in G$ and $h_1 \in H$, write $g_1 \vee g = g_1 g_2$. Then

$$g \vee x = (g_1 \vee g) \vee h_1 = (g_1 g_2) \vee h_1 = h_1\big(h_1^{-1} \triangleright (g_1 g_2)\big) = h_1(h_1^{-1} \triangleright g_1)g_3 = x g_3$$

with $g_3 = (g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1)^{-1} \triangleright g_2$, that is, $x \backslash g = g_3 \in G$. As x was arbitrary and G is a parabolic submonoid by Theorem 31, we have $\Delta_g \in G$. □

Example 33. Consider the monoid $K = \langle a, b, c \,|\, ab = ba, ac = cb, bc = ca\rangle^+$ with the submonoids $G_1 = \langle a\rangle^+$, $G_2 = \langle b\rangle^+$, $G = \langle a, b\rangle^+$ and $H = \langle c\rangle^+$. (That is, $G \cong \mathbb{N}_0^2$ and $K \cong \mathbb{N}_0^2 \rtimes \langle c\rangle^+$ where the action of c on $\mathbb{N}_0^2$ is given by swapping the coordinates.) Clearly, the monoid K is a Zappa-Szép product of the submonoids G and H. Moreover, K, G and H are Garside monoids whose minimal Garside elements are $\Delta_K = abc$, $\Delta_G = ab$, respectively $\Delta_H = c$.

1. The element $\Delta'_G = a^2 b$ is also a Garside element for the monoid G, yet $\Delta'_G \Delta_H = a^2 bc = cab^2$ is not balanced (and not equal to $\Delta_H \Delta'_G$) and so cannot be a Garside element for the monoid K.

2. For $g \in G$ one has $g \backslash a = \mathbf{1}$ if $a \preccurlyeq g$ and $g \backslash a = a$ otherwise. Thus, $\Delta_a^G = a$. However, $c \backslash a = b$, so $\Delta_a^K \neq \Delta_a^G$, although both are elements of G. (In fact, $\Delta_a^K = ab = \Delta_G$.)

3. The example also shows that forming Zappa-Szép products is not associative: We have $K = (G_1 \bowtie G_2) \bowtie H$, but any parabolic submonoid containing both b and c also must contain $a \preccurlyeq cb$, so it is not true that $K = G_1 \bowtie (G_2 \bowtie H)$.

Theorem 34. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ and that G and H are Garside monoids. Then K is a Garside monoid.*

Proof. We write Δ_g to mean Δ_g^G for $g \in G$ and Δ_h to mean Δ_h^H for $h \in H$.

By Lemma 18 and Lemma 9, the monoids act on each other by injections. Let $\mathcal{A}_G$ and $\mathcal{A}_H$ denote the sets of atoms of G respectively H. By Lemma 16, the actions act on the sets $\mathcal{A}_G$ respectively $\mathcal{A}_H$, so as these sets are finite, the actions are surjective on the sets of atoms, and thus the actions act surjectively of the whole of the submonoids by Lemma 19.

We are in the situation of Lemma 26. For $g \in G$ and $h \in H$, Proposition 27 yields that $gh' = hg'$ is the $\preccurlyeq$-LCM of g and h in K, where $h' = g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h$ and $g' = h^{-1} \triangleright g$. Moreover, by Theorem 28, the map $(g, h) \mapsto g \vee h$ is a poset isomorphism, hence $(K, \preccurlyeq)$ is a lattice. Likewise, using the map $(g, h) \mapsto g \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} h$, one has that $(K, \succcurlyeq)$ is a lattice.

As G and H are closed under $\dot{\curlyvee}$ by Lemma 15, the set of atoms of K is $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_G \cup \mathcal{A}_H$. As every element of K has a GH-decomposition and both G and H are atomic, K is generated by $\mathcal{A}_G \cup \mathcal{A}_H = \mathcal{A}$. Suppose $k = gh$ with $g \in G$ and $h \in H$. By Lemma 16, we can rewrite each expression for k as a product of atoms of K as a GH-decomposition without changing its length. Hence $||k||_{\mathcal{A}} = ||g||_{\mathcal{A}_G} + ||h||_{\mathcal{A}_H} < \infty$, so K is atomic.

Define $D_G := \bigvee_{a \in \mathcal{A}_G} \Delta_a = \bigvee \{g \backslash g' : g \in G,\, g' \in \mathcal{A}_G\}$. By Proposition 7, we have that $D_G = \Delta_{\bigvee \mathcal{A}_G}$ is balanced. Moreover, for any $h \in H$ we have by Proposition 24, Lemma 25 and Lemma 16

$$\begin{aligned} h \triangleright D_G &= \bigvee \left\{ h \triangleright (g \backslash g') : g \in G,\, g' \in \mathcal{A}_G \right\} \\ &= \bigvee \left\{ \underbrace{(g \blacktriangleleft h^{-1})}_{\in G} \backslash \Big(\underbrace{(h \triangleleft g^{-1}) \triangleright g'}_{\in \mathcal{A}_G} \Big) : g \in G,\, g' \in \mathcal{A}_G \right\} \\ &\preccurlyeq D_G \end{aligned}$$

and, likewise, $h^{-1} \triangleright D_G \preccurlyeq D_G$. Hence $h \triangleright D_G = D_G = h^{-1} \triangleright D_G$ for any $h \in H$.

Similarly $D_H := \bigvee_{a \in \mathcal{A}_H} \Delta_a$ is a balanced element satisfying $g \blacktriangleright D_H = D_H = g^{-1} \blacktriangleright D_H$ for any $g \in G$. Now define $D := D_G G_H$.

To see that D is balanced, let $g \in G$ and $h \in H$ and consider $g' = h^{-1} \triangleright g$ and $h' = g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h$. Using Proposition 24, Theorem 28, the invariance of D_G under $h^{-1} \triangleright \cdot$ and the invariance of D_H under $g^{-1} \blacktriangleright \cdot$ together with the fact that D_G and D_H are balanced, one has

$$\begin{aligned} g \vee h \preccurlyeq D &\iff (g \preccurlyeq D_G \;\text{ and }\; h \preccurlyeq D_H) \\ &\iff (h^{-1} \triangleright g \preccurlyeq h^{-1} \triangleright D_G \;\text{ and }\; g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h \preccurlyeq g^{-1} \blacktriangleright D_H) \\ &\iff (g' \preccurlyeq D_G \;\text{ and }\; h' \preccurlyeq D_H) \\ &\iff (D_G \succcurlyeq g' \;\text{ and }\; D_H \succcurlyeq h') \\ &\iff D \succcurlyeq g' \mathbin{\widetilde{\vee}} h' = g \vee h\,. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, D is a balanced element of K whose divisors include the generating set $\mathcal{A}_G \cup \mathcal{A}_H$ of K, so D is a Garside element for K. □

Remark. Example 33 shows that the construction of a Garside element for the monoid $K = G \bowtie H$ in the proof of Theorem 34 is needed; in general $\Delta_G \Delta_H$ need not be a Garside element for K.

We finish this section by giving a characterisation of Garside monoids that can be decomposed as a Zappa-Szép product.

Definition 35. A Garside monoid is $\bowtie$-*indecomposable*, if it cannot be written as a Zappa-Szép product of two non-trivial submonoids.

Theorem 36. *A Garside monoid M is Δ-pure if and only if it is $\bowtie$-indecomposable.*

Proof. We write Δ_x to mean Δ_x^M for any $x \in M$.

First assume $M = G \bowtie H$ with non-trivial monoids G and H. Choose two atoms $g \in G$ and $h \in H$. By Proposition 32, we have $\mathbf{1} \neq g \preccurlyeq \Delta_g \in G$ and $\mathbf{1} \neq h \preccurlyeq \Delta_h \in h$. As $G \cap H = \{\mathbf{1}\}$ by uniqueness of GH-decompositions, this implies that $\Delta \not\models \Delta_h$, so M is not Δ-pure.

Now assume that M is not Δ-pure. By Proposition 7, we can partition the set of atoms of M as $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{G} \dot\cup \mathcal{H}$, such that $\Delta_g = \Delta_{g'}$ for $g, g' \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\Delta_g \wedge \Delta_h = \mathbf{1}$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $h \in \mathcal{H}$. Let $G := \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle^+$, $H := \langle \mathcal{H} \rangle^+$, $D_G := \Delta_g$ (where $g \in \mathcal{G}$), and $D_H := \bigvee_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \Delta_h = \Delta_{\bigvee \mathcal{H}}$.

Claim. If $a \in \mathcal{A}$, then $a \dot\curlyvee D_G$ iff $a \in \mathcal{G}$ and $a \dot\curlyvee D_H$ iff $a \in \mathcal{H}$.

If $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$, then one has $g \preccurlyeq \Delta_g = D_G$ and $h \preccurlyeq \Delta_h \preccurlyeq D_H$ by Proposition 7. Conversely, again using Proposition 7, one has $h \wedge D_G \preccurlyeq \Delta_h \wedge \Delta_g = \mathbf{1}$, so $h \not\preccurlyeq D_G$, and finally, $g \preccurlyeq D_H$ would imply $\Delta_g \preccurlyeq \bigvee_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \Delta_h$, but the monoid generated by $\{\Delta_a : a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is free abelian and $g \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{H}$.

Claim. One has $D_G\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}D_G$, $D_G\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}D_G$, $D_H\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}D_H$, and $D_H\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}D_H$.

By Proposition 7, the elements D_G and D_H are quasi-central, so one has $D_G\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}D_G$ and $D_H\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}D_H$. Let $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$. As $x \backslash h \preccurlyeq \Delta_h$ holds for any $x \in M$ by definition of Δ_h, assuming $D_G g = h D_G$ implies $D_G \backslash h \preccurlyeq g \wedge \Delta_h = \mathbf{1}$, so $h \preccurlyeq D_G$, which is a contradiction. Similarly, $D_H h = g D_H$ would imply $D_H \backslash g \preccurlyeq h \wedge \Delta_g = \mathbf{1}$, so $g \preccurlyeq D_H$, which is a contradiction.

Claim. For $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$, one has $g \backslash h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $h \backslash g \in \mathcal{G}$.

We have $g \preccurlyeq D_G$ and $h \preccurlyeq D_H$, and also $D_G\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}D_G$ and $D_H\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}D_H$. Moreover, $g \backslash h \preccurlyeq \Delta_h \preccurlyeq D_H$ and $h \backslash g \preccurlyeq \Delta_g = D_G$ hold by definition of Δ_h, D_H, Δ_g and D_G. So in the commutative diagram on the right, all horizontal paths from the left to the right evaluate to D_H, all vertical paths from the top to the bottom evaluate to D_G, and all solid arrows are atoms. We have to show that the dashed arrows $g \backslash h$ and $h \backslash g$ are atoms.



First note that $g \backslash h$ and $h \backslash g$ must be non-trivial, as otherwise $g \preccurlyeq h$ respectively $h \preccurlyeq g$, in contradiction to the choice of g and h. For the same reason, if $g \backslash h$ or $h \backslash g$ consisted of more than one atom, all following horizontal edges in the left column respectively all following vertical edges in the bottom row would have to consist of more than one atom, contradicting the fact that h' respectively g' are atoms.

Claim. The map $g \mapsto h \backslash g$ for fixed $h \in \mathcal{H}$ is a bijection on $\mathcal{G}$ and the map $h \mapsto g \backslash h$ for fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$ is a bijection on $\mathcal{H}$.

Let $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and assume $h\backslash g_1 = h\backslash g_2$ for $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{G}$. As $h \preccurlyeq D_H$, there exists $\bar{h} \in H$ such that $h\bar{h} = D_H$. Moreover, as $g_1\backslash h \preccurlyeq D_H$ and $g_2\backslash h \preccurlyeq D_H$, there exist h_1 and $h_2 \in H$ such that $(g_1\backslash h)h_1 = D_H$ respectively $(g_2\backslash h)h_2 = D_H$. Finally, let $g_1', g_2' \in \mathcal{G}$ be such that $g_1 D_H = D_H g_1'$ and $g_2 D_H = D_H g_2'$.



As $g_1 \not\preccurlyeq D_H$, we have $D_H \vee g_1 = g_1 D_H = D_H g_1' = h\big((h\backslash g_1) \vee \bar{h}\big)$. Likewise, $D_H \vee g_2 = g_2 D_H = D_H g_2' = h\big((h\backslash g_2) \vee \bar{h}\big)$, so $h\backslash g_1 = h\backslash g_2$ implies $g_1 = g_2$ (and $g_1' = g_2'$), so the map $g \mapsto h\backslash g$ is injective. As $\mathcal{G}$ is finite, the map is a bijection. The argument for the map $h \mapsto g\backslash h$ for fixed $g \in \mathcal{G}$ is analogous.

Claim. For $x \in M$, there exist $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$ such that one has $g_1 h_1 = x = h_2 g_2$, that is, GH-decompositions and HG-decompositions exist.

Given $x \in M$, consider any expression for x as a product of atoms of M. By the previous claim, we can move all atoms in either $\mathcal{G}$ or in $\mathcal{H}$ to the front of the word, using identities of the form $g(g\backslash h) = h(h\backslash g)$ with $g, (h\backslash g) \in \mathcal{G}$ and $h, (g\backslash h) \in \mathcal{H}$.

Claim. GH-decompositions and HG-decompositions are unique.

Consider $g \in G$ and $h \in H$ and let $N := ||g||_{\mathcal{G}} < \infty$. Since $D_G\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}D_G$ holds, and as for $a \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $a \preccurlyeq D_G$ if and only if $a \in \mathcal{G}$, one has $g \preccurlyeq D_G^N$ and $D_G^N \wedge h = \mathbf{1}$. Writing $D_G^N = g\overline{g}$, we have $g \preccurlyeq D_G^N \wedge (gh) = g(\overline{g} \wedge h) \preccurlyeq g(D_G^N \wedge h) = g$, so $D_G^N \wedge (gh) = g$. Hence, if $g_1, g_2 \in G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in H$ are such that $g_1 h_1 = g_2 h_2$, then for $N := \max\{||g_1||_{\mathcal{G}}, ||g_2||_{\mathcal{G}}\}$ one has $g_1 = D_G^N \wedge (g_1 h_1) = D_G^N \wedge (g_2 h_2) = g_2$ and, by cancellativity of M, then $h_1 = h_2$.

Analogously, $D_G^N \mathbin{\widetilde{\wedge}} (hg) = g$ for $N := ||g||_{\mathcal{G}} < \infty$ yields the uniqueness of HG-decompositions.

Thus, one has $M = G \bowtie H$. □

5 Garside Zappa-Szép products

We have seen that decomposing a Garside element of a Garside monoid $K = G \bowtie H$ gives Garside elements for the factors, but that not every pair of Garside elements of the factors can be obtained in this way; cf. Example 33. Clearly one can only hope to relate the Garside structures of the product to those of the factors if the Garside elements in question are related. In light of this remark we make the following definition:

Definition 37. Say that a Zappa-Szép product $K = G \bowtie H$ is a *Garside Zappa-Szép product* if K is a Garside monoid (and hence G and H are also Garside monoids) and the Garside elements are chosen such that

$$\Delta_K = \Delta_G \Delta_H.$$

Note that the proof of Theorem 31 shows that in this situation Δ_G and Δ_H commute.

5.1 Actions and the lattice structures

In the case of a Garside Zappa-Szép product, the Garside structure of the product can be described in terms of the Garside structures of the factors; this is the content of this section.

Theorem 38. *Suppose $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product. For all $g \in G$ and $h \in H$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_K(g \vee h) &= \min(\inf_G(g), \inf_H(h)),\\ \sup_K(g \vee h) &= \max(\sup_G(g), \sup_H(h)).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The infimum of $g \vee h$ is the largest integer ℓ such that $\Delta_K^\ell \preccurlyeq g \vee h$. By Theorem 28, this is equal to the largest integer ℓ such that $\Delta_G^\ell \preccurlyeq g$ and $\Delta_H^\ell \preccurlyeq h$, which is the minimum of the infima of g and of h.

Similarly, the supremum of $g \vee h$ is the smallest integer ℓ such that $g \vee h \preccurlyeq \Delta_K^\ell$. This is equal to the smallest integer ℓ such that $g \preccurlyeq \Delta_G^\ell$ and $h \preccurlyeq \Delta_H^\ell$, which is the maximum of the suprema of g and of h. □

Lemma 39. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product. For all $g \in G$, $h \in H$, the following identities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} h \triangleright \Delta_G &= \Delta_G & \qquad \Delta_H \triangleleft g &= \Delta_H\\ g \blacktriangleright \Delta_H &= \Delta_H & \qquad \Delta_G \blacktriangleleft h &= \Delta_G\end{aligned}$$

Proof. As $\triangleright$ is an action, we can assume that h is a simple element. Suppose $h\Delta_G = g'h'$, i.e. $g' = h \triangleright \Delta_G$. Observe that $(\widetilde{\partial}_H h)h\Delta_G = \Delta_K$, so $\Delta_K \succcurlyeq g'h'$ and, in particular, g' is a simple element. Also, $h \vee \Delta_G = h(h^{-1} \triangleright \Delta_G) \in \mathcal{D}$ and thus $h^{-1} \triangleright \Delta_G \in \mathcal{D}$. For $x = (\Delta_G^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)\partial_G(h^{-1} \triangleright \Delta_G)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_G x &= \Delta_G(\Delta_G^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)\partial_G(h^{-1} \triangleright \Delta_G)\\ &= h(\Delta_G \blacktriangleleft (\Delta_G^{-1} \blacktriangleright h))\partial_G(h^{-1} \triangleright \Delta_G) && \text{by Lemma 10}\\ &= h(h^{-1} \triangleright \Delta_G)\partial_G(h^{-1} \triangleright \Delta_G) && \text{by Lemma 22}\\ &= h\Delta_G\,.\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\Delta_G \preccurlyeq h\Delta_G = g'h'$ and so $\Delta_G \preccurlyeq g'$ which implies that $g' = \Delta_G$. □

Corollary 40. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product. For all $h \in H$, one has:*

$$\begin{aligned} g \in \mathcal{D}_G &\iff h \triangleright g \in \mathcal{D}_G \iff h^{-1} \triangleright g \in \mathcal{D}_G\\ &\iff g \blacktriangleleft h \in \mathcal{D}_G \iff g \blacktriangleleft h^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}_G\end{aligned}$$

For all $g \in G$, one has:

$$\begin{aligned} h \in \mathcal{D}_H &\iff h \triangleleft g \in \mathcal{D}_H \iff h^{-1} \triangleleft g \in \mathcal{D}_H\\ &\iff g \blacktriangleright h \in \mathcal{D}_H \iff g \blacktriangleright h^{-1} \in \mathcal{D}_H\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The claim follows from Lemma 39 with Lemma 10 and Lemma 23. □

Lemma 41. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product. For all $g \in \mathcal{D}_G$ and $h \in H$, one has*

$$\partial_G(h \rhd g) = (h \lhd g) \rhd \partial_G g \qquad \text{and} \qquad \partial_G(g \blacktriangleleft h) = h^{-1} \rhd \partial_G g \,.$$

For all $g \in G$ and $h \in \mathcal{D}_H$, one has

$$\partial_H(g \blacktriangleright h) = (g \blacktriangleleft h) \blacktriangleright \partial_H h \qquad \text{and} \qquad \partial_H(h \lhd g) = g^{-1} \blacktriangleright \partial_H h \,.$$

Proof. Consider the following.

$$\begin{aligned} (h \rhd g)\,((h \lhd g) \rhd \partial_G g) &= h \rhd (g \partial_G g) && \text{by Lemma 10} \\ &= h \rhd \Delta_G \\ &= \Delta_G && \text{by Lemma 39} \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\partial_G(h \rhd g) = (h \lhd g) \rhd \partial_G g$.

For the right action we have the following.

$$\begin{aligned} &(h \rhd g) \blacktriangleright \big((h \lhd g)(g^{-1} \blacktriangleright \partial_H h)\big) \\ &\quad = \big((h \rhd g) \blacktriangleright (h \lhd g)\big)\Big(\big((h \rhd g) \blacktriangleleft (h \lhd g)\big) \blacktriangleright (g^{-1} \blacktriangleright \partial_H h)\Big) && \text{by Lemma 10} \\ &\quad = h\big(g \blacktriangleright (g^{-1} \blacktriangleright \partial_H h)\big) && \text{by Lemma 13} \\ &\quad = h \partial_H h = \Delta_H \end{aligned}$$

So, by Lemma 39, $(h \lhd g)(g^{-1} \blacktriangleright \partial_H h) = \Delta_H$, i.e. $\partial_H(h \lhd g) = (g^{-1} \blacktriangleright \partial_H h)$. The remaining identities follow with Lemma 9. □

Lemma 42. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product. Then, for all $g \in \mathcal{D}_G$ and $h \in \mathcal{D}_H$, one has*

$$\partial_K(g \vee h) = \partial_G(h^{-1} \rhd g) \vee \partial_H(g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h).$$

Proof. Suppose that $g \vee h = gh' = hg'$. Now, using Lemma 39, we have

$$hg' \partial_G g'(\Delta_G^{-1} \blacktriangleright \partial_H h) = h \Delta_G (\Delta_G^{-1} \blacktriangleright \partial_H h) = h \partial_H h \Delta_G = \Delta_H \Delta_G = \Delta_K,$$

and, similarly,

$$gh' \partial_H h'(\Delta_H^{-1} \rhd \partial_G g) = g \Delta_H (\Delta_H^{-1} \rhd \partial_G g) = g \partial_G g \Delta_H = \Delta_G \Delta_H = \Delta_K \,.$$

Hence

$$\partial_K(g \vee h) = \partial_G g'(\Delta_G^{-1} \blacktriangleright \partial_H h) = \partial_H h'(\Delta_H^{-1} \rhd \partial_G g) \,,$$

And thus,

$$\partial_K(g \vee h) = \partial_G g' \vee \partial_H h' = \partial_G(h^{-1} \rhd g) \vee \partial_H(g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h).$$

□

5.2 Normal forms in Garside Zappa-Szép products

We will show in this section that, in the case of a Garside Zappa-Szép product $K = G \bowtie H$, the language of normal form words in the product K can be described in terms of the Cartesian product of the languages of normal form words in the factors G and H.

Recall that we write $x_1|x_2|\cdots|x_\ell$ to denote a word in (non-trivial) simple elements together with the proposition that this word is in left normal form, that we write $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ for the language of words in normal form and $\mathcal{L}$ for the restriction of this language to proper simple elements.

Definition 43. The set of equations (2), from Lemma 10, gives us a natural way to extend the actions on elements to actions on strings of elements. We can define the actions recursively as follows: The actions take the empty string to the empty string, act on length one strings by acting on the element, and act on longer strings by

$$\begin{aligned}
h \rhd (g_1 \,.\, g_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell) &= (h \rhd g_1) \,.\, \big((h \lhd g_1) \rhd (g_2 \,.\, g_3 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell)\big),\\
(h_1 \,.\, h_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, h_\ell) \lhd g &= \big((h_1 \,.\, h_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, h_{\ell-1}) \lhd (h_\ell \rhd g)\big) \,.\, (h_\ell \lhd g),\\
g \blacktriangleright (h_1 \,.\, h_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, h_\ell) &= (g \blacktriangleright h_1) \,.\, \big((g \blacktriangleleft h_1) \blacktriangleright (h_2 \,.\, h_3 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, h_\ell)\big),\\
(g_1 \,.\, g_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell) \blacktriangleleft h &= \big((g_1 \,.\, g_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_{\ell-1}) \blacktriangleleft (g_\ell \blacktriangleright h)\big) \,.\, (g_\ell \blacktriangleleft h).
\end{aligned}$$

Likewise, if G and H act on each other by bijections, we can extend the inverse actions to strings by

$$\begin{aligned}
h^{-1} \rhd (g_1 \,.\, g_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell) &= (h^{-1} \rhd g_1) \,.\, \big((g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h)^{-1} \rhd (g_2 \,.\, g_3 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell)\big),\\
(h_1 \,.\, h_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, h_\ell) \lhd g^{-1} &= \big((h_1 \,.\, h_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, h_{\ell-1}) \lhd (g \blacktriangleleft h_\ell^{-1})^{-1}\big) \,.\, (h_\ell \lhd g^{-1}),\\
g^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1 \,.\, h_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, h_\ell) &= (g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1) \,.\, \big((h_1^{-1} \lhd g)^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_2 \,.\, h_3 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, h_\ell)\big),\\
(g_1 \,.\, g_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell) \blacktriangleleft h^{-1} &= \big((g_1 \,.\, g_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_{\ell-1}) \blacktriangleleft (h \lhd g_\ell^{-1})^{-1}\big) \,.\, (g_\ell \blacktriangleleft h^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 10 and Lemma 23, these actions on strings of elements commute with the multiplication map $g_1 \,.\, g_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell \mapsto g_1 g_2 \cdots g_\ell$.

Proposition 44. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product, and let $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{D}_G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{D}_H$.*

Then one has $\partial_K(g_1 \vee h_1) \wedge (g_2 \vee h_2) = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\partial_G(h^{-1} \rhd g_1) \wedge g_2 = \mathbf{1}$ and $\partial_H(g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1) \wedge h_2 = \mathbf{1}$.

If, moreover, $g_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$ and $h_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$, then one has $(g_1 \vee h_1)|(g_2 \vee h_2)$ if and only if $(h_1^{-1} \rhd g_1)|g_2$ and $(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1)|h_2$.

Proof. By Theorem 28 and Lemma 42, we have

$$\partial_K(g_1 \vee h_1) \wedge (g_2 \vee h_2) = (\partial_G(h_1^{-1} \rhd g_1) \wedge g_2) \vee (\partial_H(g_1^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1) \wedge h_2)\ ,$$

so $\partial_K(g_1 \vee h_1) \wedge (g_2 \vee h_2) = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\partial_G(h^{-1} \rhd g_1) \wedge g_2 = \mathbf{1}$ and $\partial_H(g^{-1} \blacktriangleright h_1) \wedge h_2 = \mathbf{1}$, so the first claim holds.

The second claim follows, as for simple elements s_1, s_2 of any Garside monoid, one has $s_1|s_2$ if and only if $\partial s_1 \wedge s_2 = \mathbf{1}$ and $s_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$ by definition. □

Corollary 45. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product, and let $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{D}_G$ and $h_1, h_2 \in \mathcal{D}_H$.*

Then the following hold:

$$\partial_K(g_1h_1) \wedge (g_2h_2) = \mathbf{1} \iff \begin{cases} \partial_G(g_1 \blacktriangleleft h_1) \wedge g_2 = \mathbf{1} \\ \text{and} \\ \partial_H h_1 \wedge (g_2 \blacktriangleright h_2) = \mathbf{1} \end{cases}$$

$$\partial_K(g_1h_1) \wedge (h_2g_2) = \mathbf{1} \iff \begin{cases} \partial_G(g_1 \blacktriangleleft h_1) \wedge (h_2 \triangleright g_2) = \mathbf{1} \\ \text{and} \\ \partial_H h_1 \wedge h_2 = \mathbf{1} \end{cases}$$

$$\partial_K(h_1g_1) \wedge (g_2h_2) = \mathbf{1} \iff \begin{cases} \partial_G g_1 \wedge g_2 = \mathbf{1} \\ \text{and} \\ \partial_H(h_1 \triangleleft g_1) \wedge (g_2 \blacktriangleright h_2) = \mathbf{1} \end{cases}$$

$$\partial_K(h_1g_1) \wedge (h_2g_2) = \mathbf{1} \iff \begin{cases} \partial_G g_1 \wedge (h_2 \triangleright g_2) = \mathbf{1} \\ \text{and} \\ \partial_H(h_1 \triangleleft g_1) \wedge h_2 = \mathbf{1} \end{cases}$$

If, moreover, $g_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$ and $h_2 \neq \mathbf{1}$, then one has the following:

$$\begin{array}{llllll} g_1h_1|g_2h_2 & \iff & (g_1 \blacktriangleleft h_1)|g_2 & \text{and} & h_1|(g_2 \blacktriangleright h_2) \\ g_1h_1|h_2g_2 & \iff & (g_1 \blacktriangleleft h_1)|(h_2 \triangleright g_2) & \text{and} & h_1|h_2 \\ h_1g_1|g_2h_2 & \iff & g_1|g_2 & \text{and} & (h_1 \triangleleft g_1)|(g_2 \blacktriangleright h_2) \\ h_1g_1|h_2g_2 & \iff & g_1|(h_2 \triangleright g_2) & \text{and} & (h_1 \triangleleft g_1)|h_2 \end{array}$$

Proof. The equivalences in the first list follow from Lemma 13 and Proposition 44 together with the fact that, for all $g \in G$ and $h \in H$, one has $gh = g \vee (g \blacktriangleright h)$ and $hg = h \vee (h \triangleright g)$. The equivalences in the second list then follow with Lemma 12. □

Proposition 46. *Given the normal form $g_1h_1|\cdots|g_mh_m \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_K$ of $k \in K$ with GH-decomposition $k = gh$, the following algorithm computes the normal forms $g'_1|\cdots|g'_p \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_G$ of g and $h'_1|\cdots|h'_q \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_H$ of h.*

1: $\mathsf{Word}_K \leftarrow g_1h_1|g_2h_2|\cdots|g_mh_m$
2: $\mathsf{Word}_G \leftarrow \varepsilon$
3: ***repeat***
4: *Write each simple factor of* Word_K *as a GH-decomposition, i.e.* $\mathsf{Word}_K = g'_1h'_1|g'_2h'_2|\cdots|g'_\ell h'_\ell$
5: ***if*** $g'_1 \neq \mathbf{1}$ ***then***
6: $\mathsf{Word}_G \leftarrow \mathsf{Word}_G \,.\, g'_1$
7: ***if*** $h'_\ell \neq \mathbf{1}$ ***then***
8: $\mathsf{Word}_K \leftarrow h'_1g'_2|h'_2g'_3|\cdots|h'_{\ell-1}g'_\ell|h'_\ell$
9: ***else***
10: $\mathsf{Word}_K \leftarrow h'_1g'_2|h'_2g'_3|\cdots|h'_{\ell-1}g'_\ell$
11: ***end if***
12: ***end if***
13: ***until*** $g'_1 = \mathbf{1}$
14: ***return*** $(\mathsf{Word}_G, \mathsf{Word}_K)$

Proof. By Corollary 45, the returned words are in normal form. □

Proposition 47. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product, that $g_1 \,.\, g_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell$ is a word in $\mathcal{D}_G^*$ and that $h \in H$. Define*

$$g_1' \,.\, g_2' \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell' := h \rhd (g_1 \,.\, g_2 \,.\, \cdots \,.\, g_\ell).$$

For $i = 1, \ldots \ell - 1$, one has $\partial_G g_i \wedge g_{i+1} = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\partial_G g_i' \wedge g_{i+1}' = \mathbf{1}$. Moreover, $g_1|g_2|\cdots|g_\ell$ if and only if $g_1'|g_2'|\cdots|g_\ell'$.

Proof. First observe that, for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, we have $g_i' = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $g_i = \mathbf{1}$ by Lemma 12.

Now consider the case when $\ell = 2$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_G g_1' \wedge g_2' &= \partial_G(h \rhd g_1) \wedge ((h \lhd g_1) \rhd g_2) \\ &= ((h \lhd g_1) \rhd \partial_G g_1) \wedge ((h \lhd g_1) \rhd g_2) && \text{by Lemma 41} \\ &= (h \lhd g_1) \rhd (\partial_G g_1 \wedge g_2) && \text{by Proposition 24} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 12, $\partial_G g_1' \wedge g_2' = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\partial_G g_1 \wedge g_2 = \mathbf{1}$. As $g_2' = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $g_2 = \mathbf{1}$, we have $g_1'|g_2'$ if and only if $g_1|g_2$ as desired.

For the general case, if we let $h_i' = h \lhd g_1 g_2 \cdots g_{i-1}$ then we have that $g_i' \,.\, g_{i+1}' = h_i' \rhd (g_i.g_{i+1})$. So each length 2 subword reduces to the $\ell = 2$ case. □

Corollary 48. *The actions on words fix setwise the languages $\mathcal{L}_G$ and $\mathcal{L}_H$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 47 as, by Lemma 39, the initial power of Δ in a word in normal form must be preserved by the actions. □

Lemma 49. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product, that $g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_\ell \in \mathcal{D}_G$ and $h, h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_\ell \in \mathcal{D}_H$ such that $\partial_H h \wedge (g_1 \blacktriangleright h_1) = \mathbf{1}$ and $g_1 h_1 | g_2 h_2 | \cdots | g_\ell h_\ell$.*

Then $hg_1|h_1g_2|\cdots|h_{\ell-1}g_\ell$ and, moreover, $hg_1|h_1g_2|\cdots|h_{\ell-1}g_\ell|h_\ell$ if $h_\ell \neq \mathbf{1}$.

Proof. If we let $h_0 = h$ then, by Corollary 45, the hypotheses imply

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, \ell - 1\}, \qquad \partial_G(g_i \blacktriangleleft h_i) \wedge g_{i+1} = \mathbf{1} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_H h_{i-1} \wedge (g_i \blacktriangleright h_i) = \mathbf{1}\,.$$

Moreover, either $g_i \neq \mathbf{1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, or $h_i \neq \mathbf{1}$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, \ell$.

Now consider the following.

$$\begin{aligned} &(g_i \blacktriangleright h_i) \rhd \big((g_i \blacktriangleleft h_i) \,.\, g_{i+1}\big) \\ &\quad = \big((g_i \blacktriangleright h_i) \rhd (g_i \blacktriangleleft h_i)\big).\big((g_i \blacktriangleright h_i) \lhd (g_i \blacktriangleleft h_i)\big) \rhd g_{i+1} \\ &\quad = g_i \,.\, (h_i \rhd g_{i+1}) && \text{by Lemma 13} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\big(h_{i-1} \,.\, (g_i \blacktriangleright h_i)\big) \lhd (g_i \blacktriangleleft h_i) \\ &\quad = h_{i-1} \lhd \big((g_i \blacktriangleright h_i) \rhd (g_i \blacktriangleleft h_i)\big).(g_i \blacktriangleright h_i) \lhd (g_i \blacktriangleleft h_i) \\ &\quad = (h_{i-1} \lhd g_i) \,.\, h_i && \text{by Lemma 13} \end{aligned}$$

So, by Proposition 47, we have for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1$ that $\partial_G g_i \wedge (h_i \rhd g_{i+1}) = \mathbf{1}$ and $\partial_H(h_{i-1} \lhd g_i) \wedge h_i = \mathbf{1}$, which, using Corollary 45, implies the claim. □

Proposition 50. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product*

Given $g_1|\cdots|g_m \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_G$ and $h_1|\cdots|h_n \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_H$, the following algorithm computes the normal form of $g_1 \cdots g_m h_1 \cdots h_n$.

1: $\mathsf{Word}_G \leftarrow g_1|g_2|\cdots|g_m$
2: $\mathsf{Word}_K \leftarrow h_1|h_2|\cdots|h_n$
3: ***while*** $\mathsf{Word}_G \neq \varepsilon$ ***do***
4: $\quad \mathsf{Word}_G \,.\, g \leftarrow \mathsf{Word}_G$ /* *extract last simple factor of normal form* */
5: $\quad$ *Write each simple factor of* Word_K *as a HG-decomposition, i.e.* $\mathsf{Word}_K = h'_1g'_1|h'_2g'_2|\cdots|h'_\ell g'_\ell$.
6: $\quad$ ***if*** $g'_\ell = \mathbf{1}$ ***then***
7: $\quad\quad \mathsf{Word}_K \leftarrow gh'_1|g'_1h'_2|\cdots|g'_{\ell-1}h'_\ell$
8: $\quad$ ***else***
9: $\quad\quad \mathsf{Word}_K \leftarrow gh'_1|g'_1h'_2|\cdots|g'_{\ell-1}h'_\ell|g'_\ell$
10: $\quad$ ***end if***
11: ***end while***
12: ***return*** Word_K

Proof. By Lemma 49, the word computed in line 7 respectively 9 is in normal form. □

Theorem 51. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product. Then the map $\phi\colon \overline{\mathcal{L}}_G \times \overline{\mathcal{L}}_H \to \overline{\mathcal{L}}_K$ given by*

$$\phi\big(g_1|g_2|\cdots|g_m\,,\,h_1|h_2|\cdots|h_n\big) = \mathrm{NF}\big(g_1g_2\cdots g_mh_1h_2\cdots h_n\big)$$

is a bijection.

Proof. Clearly $\mathrm{NF}\big(g_1g_2\cdots g_mh_1h_2\cdots h_n\big) \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_K$, so the map ϕ is well-defined.

The map ϕ is surjective, as $k_1|\cdots|k_\ell \in \overline{\mathcal{L}}_K = \phi\big(\mathrm{NF}(g)\,,\,\mathrm{NF}(h)\big)$, where g_kh_k is the GH-decomposition of $k_1\cdots k_\ell \in K$.

Now assume $g_1|\cdots|g_m$ and $g'_1|\cdots|g'_p$ in $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_G$ and $h_1|\cdots|h_n$ and $h'_1|\cdots|h'_q$ in $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_H$ satisfy $\phi\big(g_1|\cdots|g_m\,,\,h_1|\cdots|h_n\big) = \phi\big(g'_1|\cdots|g'_p\,,\,h'_1|\cdots|h'_q\big)$. Then one has $g_1\cdots g_mh_1\cdots h_n = g'_1\cdots g'_ph'_1\cdots h'_q$ and thus, by uniqueness of GH-decompositions, $g_1\cdots g_m = g'_1\cdots g'_p$ and $h_1\cdots h_n = h'_1\cdots h'_q$. Uniqueness of normal forms then yields $g_1|\cdots|g_m = g'_1|\cdots|g'_p$ and $h_1|\cdots|h_n = h'_1|\cdots|h'_q$, so the map ϕ is injective. □

Remark. The map ϕ is given by the algorithm of Proposition 50 and the map ϕ^{-1} is given by the algorithm from Proposition 46.

Corollary 52. *Suppose that $K = G \bowtie H$ is a Garside Zappa-Szép product. Then the map $\psi\colon \overline{\mathcal{L}}_G \times \overline{\mathcal{L}}_H \to \overline{\mathcal{L}}_K$ given by*

$$\psi\big(g_1|g_2|\cdots|g_m\,,\,h_1|h_2|\cdots|h_n\big) = \mathrm{NF}\big((g_1g_2\cdots g_m) \vee (h_1h_2\cdots h_n)\big)$$

is a bijection.

Proof. By Proposition 47, $h'_1.h'_2.\cdot\cdot\cdot.h'_n = (g_1.g_2.\cdot\cdot\cdot.g_m)^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1.h_2.\cdot\cdot\cdot.h_n)$ is a word in normal form. So, by Proposition 27, $\psi(g_1\,.\,g_2\,.\cdot\cdot\cdot.\,g_m, h_1\,.\,h_2\,.\cdot\cdot\cdot.\,h_n) = \phi(g_1\,.\,g_2\,.\cdot\cdot\cdot.\,g_m, (g_1g_2\cdots g_m)^{-1} \blacktriangleright (h_1\,.\,h_2\,.\cdot\cdot\cdot.\,h_n))$. Therefore, as ψ is a composition of bijections, it is a bijection. □

References

[ACIM09] A. L. Agore, A. Chirvăsitu, B. Ion, and G. Militaru. Bicrossed products for finite groups. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 12(2-5):481–488, October 2009. MR2501197 (2010e:20050)

[AM11] A. L. Agore and G. Militaru. Extending structures II: The quantum version. *J. Algebra*, 336:321–341, 2011. MR2802546

[Bri05] Matthew G. Brin. On the Zappa-Szép product. *Comm. Algebra*, 33(2):393–424, 2005. MR2124335 (2005k:20170)

[Cas41] Giuseppina Casadio. Costruzione di gruppi come prodotto di sottogruppi permutabili. *Univ. Roma e Ist. Naz. Alta Mat. Rend. Mat. e Appl. (5)*, 2:348–360, 1941. MR0018176 (8,251d)

[DDG+] Patrick Dehornoy, François Digne, Eddy Godelle, Daan Krammer, and Jean Michel. *Foundations of Garside Theory.*

[Deh02] Patrick Dehornoy. Groupes de Garside. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 35(2):267–306, 2002. MR1914933 (2003f:20068)

[DP99] Patrick Dehornoy and Luis Paris. Gaussian groups and Garside groups, two generalisations of Artin groups. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 79(3):569–604, 1999. MR1710165 (2001f:20061)

[God07] Eddy Godelle. Parabolic subgroups of Garside groups. *J. Algebra*, 317(1):1–16, 2007. MR2360138 (2008h:20054)

[God10] Eddy Godelle. Parabolic subgroups of Garside groups II: ribbons. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 214(11):2044–2062, 2010. MR2645337 (2011j:20091)

[Kun83] M. Kunze. Zappa products. *Acta Math. Hungar.*, 41(3-4):225–239, 1983. MR703736 (84j:20057)

[Pic01] Matthieu Picantin. The center of thin Gaussian groups. *J. Algebra*, 245(1):92–122, 2001. MR1868185 (2002h:20053)

[RS55] L. Rédei and J. Szép. Die Verallgemeinerung der Theorie des Gruppenproduktes von Zappa-Casadio. *Acta. Sci. Math. Szeged*, 16:165–170, 1955. MR0075941 (17,823d)

[Szé50] J. Szép. On the structure of groups which can be represented as the product of two subgroups. *Acta Sci. Math. Szeged*, 12(Leopoldo Fejer et Frederico Riesz LXX annos natis dedicatus, Pars A):57–61, 1950. MR0037296 (12,239e)

[Szé51] J. Szép. Zur Theorie der endlichen einfachen Gruppen. *Acta Sci. Math. Szeged*, 14:111–112, 1951. MR0048439 (14,13j)

[Szé62] Jenö Szép. Sulle strutture fattorizzabili. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat. (8)*, 32:649–652, 1962. MR0148753 (26 #6259)

[Tak81] Mitsuhiro Takeuchi. Matched pairs of groups and bismash products of Hopf algebras. *Comm. Algebra*, 9(8):841–882, 1981. MR611561 (83f:16013)

[Zap42] Guido Zappa. Sulla costruzione dei gruppi prodotto di due dati sottogruppi permutabili tra loro. In *Atti Secondo Congresso Un. Mat. Ital., Bologna, 1940*, pages 119–125. Edizioni Cremonense, Rome, 1942. MR0019090 (8,367d)

Volker Gebhardt
E-mail: v.gebhardt@uws.edu.au

Stephen Tawn
E-mail: stephen@tawn.co.uk
URL: http://www.stephentawn.info

University of Western Sydney
Centre for Research in Mathematics
Locked Bag 1797, Penrith NSW 2751, Australia
URL: http://www.uws.edu.au/crm